

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2472

ISAAC MUSOKE,

Petitioner,

versus

ALBERTO R. GONZALES, Attorney General,

Respondent.

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals. (A95-543-808)

Submitted: June 27, 2005

Decided: July 11, 2005

Before LUTTIG, MOTZ, and SHEDD, Circuit Judges.

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Matthew Jode Segal, Jonathan H. Harrison, Carrie Valladares, PRESTON GATES & ELLIS, L.L.P., Seattle, Washington, for Petitioner. Peter D. Keisler, Assistant Attorney General, Michelle E. Gorden, Office of Immigration Litigation, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C.; Mary Anne F. Carnival, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, New York, New York, for Respondent.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Isaac Musoke, a native and citizen of Uganda, petitions for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals ("Board") affirming without opinion the Immigration Judge's order denying his requests for asylum, withholding of removal, and protection under the Convention Against Torture. In his petition for review, Musoke contends that the Board and Immigration Judge erred in denying his applications for withholding of removal and protection under the Convention Against Torture.

"To qualify for withholding of removal, a petitioner must show that he faces a clear probability of persecution because of his race, religion, nationality, membership in a particular social group, or political opinion." Rusu v. INS, 296 F.3d 316, 324 n.13 (4th Cir. 2002) (citing INS v. Stevic, 467 U.S. 407, 430 (1984)). To qualify for protection under the Convention Against Torture, a petitioner bears the burden of demonstrating that "it is more likely than not that he or she would be tortured if removed to the proposed country of removal." 8 C.F.R. § 1208.16(c)(2) (2004). Based on our review of the record, we find that Musoke has failed to meet these standards.

Accordingly, we deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED